

## **MEETING RECORD**

<b>NAME OF GROUP:</b>	PLANNING COMMISSION
<b>DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING:</b>	Wednesday, February 27, 2002, 1:00 p.m., Room 113, First Floor, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska
<b>MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:</b>	Mary Bills, Jon Carlson, Steve Duvall, Gerry Krieser, Patte Newman, Greg Schwinn and Tommy Taylor (Cecil Steward absent; Linda Hunter resigned); Kathleen Sellman, Kent Morgan, Stephen Henrichsen, Mike DeKalb, Duncan Ross, Mike Brienzo and Jean Walker of the Planning Department; Allan Abbott of Public Works & Utilities; Dave Knopick of Gould, Evans (the Comprehensive Plan consultant); other interested citizens.
<b>STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING:</b>	Special Planning Commission Work Session on the "draft" 2025 Lincoln City/Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan, dated February 6, 2002.

Chair Schwinn called the meeting to order, explaining that this is an informational meeting only, with no questions or comments from the audience.

Kathleen Sellman, the Director of Planning explained the process for the Planning Commission to make amendments to the draft Plan. The Commission has until April 3rd to think about those things that need amending. If the staff can be helpful to the Commissioners in putting something together, please let Kathleen Sellman or Kent Morgan know and the staff will assist. There may be things that are straight forward enough that do not require staff involvement and that is fine. Sellman noted that the Commission has made comments about things that need to be changed while going through the document. Any changes to this draft will require formal amendment by the Planning Commission during the voting stage.

Newman referred to the staff memorandum about the benchmark indicators and wondered whether that is something that is up to the Commission to bring forward as an amendment. Morgan indicated that to have been an inadvertent omission and the staff will bring a proposed amendment forward for the Planning Commission to take action upon.

Carlson inquired about amendments being requested by other city/county departments. Sellman acknowledged that there will be information and proposals that other departments

will provide in terms of additional information or requests for changes. Those proposed changes will be provided as a part of the staff report by the end of next week.

It was suggested that the departmental staff could make brief presentations on any proposed amendments at the beginning of the public hearing on March 13th, if the Commission so desired.

In terms of addressing the requests by individual departments, it was suggested that the Commission could 1) consider each request as part of their decision making process; or 2) could make one motion adopting the proposed changes. Carlson suggested making the staff proposed changes like a consent agenda so the Commission could accept the staff changes as one motion.

It was clarified that the hearing on March 13th will begin at 1:00 p.m. and again at 6:00 p.m., no matter what time the afternoon session concludes. The March 27<sup>th</sup> hearing will begin at 1:00 with no ending time predesignated.

#### **FUTURE CONDITIONS:**

In further response to discussions held at the last work session, Steve Henrichsen of the Planning staff provided a presentation regarding the process involved in coming up with the proposed growth areas. He displayed maps of all of the growth concepts that were shown at the public workshops. The Comprehensive Plan Committee (CPC) took all of those concepts and asked for additional permutation of different concepts, reducing the eight concepts down to Futures A, B and C. Futures A, B and C were analyzed by the staff throughout the summer. There were more public workshops held on the three Futures concepts. There was a lot of public support at the workshops in August for multi-directional growth. This resulted in the “Draft” Comprehensive Plan Committee version which was shown to the City Council and County Board in October, 2001. The November 2nd version of the Urban Growth Tiers added some areas to the south and west. There is a considerable amount of existing area for commercial and residential development outside of Tier I that is in the existing city, i.e. Vintage Heights, Fallbrook, Vavrina Meadows, etc.

Schwinn does not like the finite end on the lines. Page F33 includes language, “...Within a specific directional growth area, when the infrastructure is complete within a Priority 1 area, improvements should not commence in the Priority 2 area until the infrastructure is completed in the remaining Priority 1 areas.” That basically says that until all of Priority I is done you can’t go into Priority 2. Schwinn suggested that there may be some areas in Priority I that no one wants to go to. He thinks this statement on F33 is ludicrous. Henrichsen suggested that it is up to the community, Planning Commission and City

Council to determine what should be identified as Priority I. Schwinn believes all or most of the Priority I areas are already being platted and/or being discussed.

Bills does not understand why we have to have priority areas. Why do you need to prioritize Tier I? She thinks we are trying to dictate the market rather than let the market determine the growth area. Henrichsen further explained that the city/county is looking for direction from the community as to where to spend the CIP dollars. We’ve also heard from the private sector who want to know where the dollars will be spent next. This is an effort to orderly plan the improvements based on where the community wants to grow. Abbott commented that it comes down to dollars. In the next 5-6 year CIP, we are going to be spending double the money we’ve ever spent to take care of development that is already planned or being discussed. Most of the money we have in the first 6-8 years is to get to the areas already underway; and the goal was to get all of the infrastructure into everything within the dark red (cinnamon)--Phase I within 10 years. In order to pay for it with strictly city dollars will require rate increases. Whether this is acceptable or whether some of the dollars have to be made up with impact fees is something the community has to decide. Bond issues are fine if you’ve got a revenue stream to pay for the bonds after you issue them. We are using bonds with water and wastewater. We have not yet indicated bond issues for the street system because you’re going to have to get additional revenues on down the line to keep the program going. The proformas have not been developed because we don’t know what revenue stream we are going to be using. We have not determined when the impact fees are going to be collected. That is another regulation proposal that will be coming before the Planning Commission after the Comprehensive Plan.

Schwinn noted the indication in the Plan of constructing 25 years worth of improvements in 20 years, yet we don’t have the plan to do that yet. When you throw the term “impact fee” out, if you collect money to build a road, that money can’t go in the general fund—you have to build the road. Same way with parks. Abbott agreed.

Henrichsen further suggested that there is not a timeframe associated with the priority areas. The concept on how to do 25 years in 20 years is in the financial resources section.

Schwinn again referred to the language cited on page F33. Henrichsen clarified that the intent is that in order to have certainty for development in the priority areas, you would not go to the next area until you have programmed the necessary infrastructure. Bills would like to see more flexibility. If we have an employer coming to town that wants to go into a certain area, we need some flexibility to make changes in the priorities. Otherwise, we’ve lost employers. We need to be friendlier to companies coming into town by providing flexibility. Abbott commented that being friendly and fiscally able to do it are two different

things. It does not say you can't go into those areas. It is based on the amount of money the city can contribute. If you want to go into those other areas, the development has to pay for it. It takes more than laying a line in order to have sewer service. Growth in certain areas of the city could mean expansion of the treatment plant.

Bills is confused – it seems like we're trying to set up the rules and then go back and figure out how to finance it. Then when we find the financing scheme, we'll have to go back and change the rules. Abbott agreed that a financing scheme could change the rules. But, if we're going to have a system to serve where you want to go, we have to have some semblance of order in order to get it. We can't do everything in 1-2-3 years. He thought the purpose of this process was to determine what the community wants to do and what cost can be borne by whom, the fair share, etc.

### ***Mobility & Transportation*** (F87)

Abbott introduced the ***Mobility & Transportation*** discussion by displaying a map of the “12 minute city network” and discussed the level of service that can be anticipated to serve the Comprehensive Plan with the buildout of Tier I and Tier II, i.e. middle or lower level of Service C.

Carlson suggested that the reality is that you are going to have varying levels of service in different parts of the City. Abbott agreed. What we're trying to do is protect the fringe areas from a transportation standpoint so that we don't end up with the same problems we have in the inner city or core city. We want to be able to come in and do some widening without the problems that would be experienced with widening in the inner city.

Mike Brienzo of the Planning staff then did an overview of the federal requirements of the transportation plan. The city/county goes through a process every year to comply with federal certification. If we fall out of certification we could jeopardize our federal dollars. The Federal Planning Requirements for the Long Range Transportation Plan are found on page F88.

Schwinn noted that the LRTP was just updated this last year. Brienzo concurred. The LRTP is a 5-year plan. The 1994 Comprehensive Plan developed the LRTP. In December of 1999, we had gone through some director changes, and we were required by the feds to update that LRTP. The new land use plan resets the clock.

Bills expressed concern about railroad crossing conflicts. Abbott stated that Public Works has been working with the railroad along Hwy 2 and 56<sup>th</sup> Street, and they have agreed to change their hours of operation in order to avoid rush hour.

Newman was very disappointed that the Mobility & Transportation Task Force recommendations regarding pedestrians does not appear in this Plan. Morgan recalled that the CPC directed the staff to rework the task force recommendation to modify the tone, language and length of the introductory sections to each of the strategies. The strategies for the most part remained unchanged. Carlson concurred. The CPC asked the staff to go back and make the list “less preaching”. Carlson stated that he liked the initial language as well. None of the strategies changed. Newman would prefer to put everything back in. The Mobility & Transportation Task Force wanted to emphasize some of the alternative transportation opportunities and she thinks it all got taken out. Another concern is two pages on public transportation with no reference to StarTran, which she believes is critical. Morgan offered to provide Newman with the original text. The reference to StarTran was minimized in order focus on the concept of “public transportation”. Abbott also pointed out that StarTran is part of the city and not a separate operation.

Morgan will provide the original language and the Commission can amend it back in if they wish.

Newman pointed out once again that at the bike pedestrian workshop, it was agreed that we need a staff person who looks after the bike part of it, the sidewalk part of it, and the pedestrian part of it. There was discussion about hiring a person specifically for bike/pedestrian issues and now we’re down to identifying an organization. This is terrifying.

*Bicycle Amenities* on page F97 were discussed. Schwinn does not believe the requirement to develop bicycle rack and storage requirements for new developments belongs in the Comprehensive Plan. Newman believes it is very important. Schwinn then wondered whether it should be required in the older and existing areas. Bills also does not want to “require” it.

Newman pointed out that some bicycles do cost a lot, and it is very important to the biking community to have a secure place to lock their bikes. Bills could see “encouraging” commercial development to put bike racks up, but she does not think it should be “required”. Schwinn thinks the liability and security issues will be huge.

Page F95 lists a strategy: “Identify at least one north-south and one east-west corridor to pilot a dedicated painted bike lane, and have installed within one year of Plan approval.” Taylor believes this is important and it would also be effective for runners. Abbott pointed out that the Technical Committee met last Friday and discussed this issue. The concern is putting a time limit on it because if it doesn’t get done within a year, we are in non-compliance with the Plan, which means we have to go back and make corrections and you

may not be able to continue with federal funding. Abbott also cautioned that if we're going to have a bike lane, parking has to come off both sides of the street. One-way versus two-way streets also makes a difference. Abbott further pointed out that if parking is removed for bike lanes, that parking has to go somewhere, whether it's a garage or parking facility or whatever.

Brienzo stated that the Bicycle Pedestrian Committee is going to suggest that the timeline be one year from adoption of the Bicycle Facilities Plan.

Morgan advised that the Technical Committee will be recommending changes to the Commission as well.

Bills referred to page F91: “Programs to retrofit established sections of town with pedestrian amenities.” Are we going to require corner lots in an old neighborhood to have sidewalks on both sides of the corner? Brienzo explained that this directs staff to develop a set of standards, and we would be encouraging that those standards be included as part of the development review so that plans that are brought forward must address these issues. Abbott explained that sidewalks would be an assessment against the property. If we get a request or complaint where there is no sidewalk and there is a need for a sidewalk, then it goes through the process of public hearing before the City Council for an assessment district.

Carlson believes that it does make more sense in the new draft to have Public Transportation addressed in a more generic sense rather than starting with “StarTran”.

The widening of Interstate 80 was then discussed. Brienzo advised that they are beginning to program the widening of the bridges now. Abbott believes that the six lanes around Lincoln are scheduled to be in construction around 2005 with anticipated completion by 2012.

Bills then inquired about the beltways. She wondered whether the uses are planned for the area up to the south beltway. Do we know where some of the planned commercial sites might be? Morgan explained at the map. Only general areas for commercial have been identified to give the market some flexibility. Bills wondered what kind of answer a real estate broker might get if they call and check the zoning on a piece of residential property they are selling. Morgan advised that they will be advised of the existing zoning, but also will be advised that the Comprehensive Plan shows it as residential but within a quarter of a mile there is an identified site that could be industrial or commercial and could be moved around. The staff attempts to tell them what the plan shows and anticipates.

Schwinn inquired whether we have located the concept of an urban village past the beltway. Morgan advised that the urban village concept is not as it was in the previous plan. There is an incentive system built into the new plan.

Newman noted that the biggest issue the Commission has heard about is the Yankee Hill overpass. She wanted to know what studies have been done to date and what they have shown. Brienzo referred to the beltway study which touched on the crossing of Wilderness Park. The only report dealing with it in detail is the S1/S2 subarea study which looked at elements of Wilderness Park. In that study, it did address that crossing of the park and addressed the possibility of closing some roadways that cross the park. It did not address any of the southwest urban growth. The conclusion from Olsson Associates fed into the Wilderness Park Study and that report is on the internet, the conclusions of which were a recommendation to further study in more detail. Morgan added that the staff has done the network analysis, but the CPC did not go into the network level detail. Brienzo further noted that the staff did make the connection in the system network and looked at the traffic. The benefit it would have to the rest of the network was inconclusive. The task force did not have enough information to include or exclude it and wanted further study. Abbott offered that the studies that have been done before did not include any of the southwest development that is currently in Tier I. He believes the study is needed to find out what happens because we never have gotten to the detail of what really happens. There is going to be a lot of development. There are concerns with the people that live along

Old Cheney, west of Warlick. Until we do a study, some of those questions aren't going to be answered. It comes down to, is it going to be expensive? Yes. Can it be done? Yes. Is it needed? That's what the study is for. It is not a design that says this is where it is going to be built. It's a study to see what happens to the rest of the system if we don't build it. It's a feasibility study—not the design. It is not written in stone that it is or is not going to be built. We don't have an answer to the question of what really happens.

Newman wonders whether it really can be done. She posed the question to Abbott--in your experience dealing with the federal government, will they fund a project such as this in an environmentally sensitive area? Abbott believes that they would as they have in the past. But, there is no use arguing about that if you don't need it. So the first thing you determine is if it is needed. We must not assume that it can't be done.

Bills referred to the proposed city street projects, noting that there are no widening of any interior streets that run north and south. She knows it is not popular, but 27<sup>th</sup>, 40<sup>th</sup>, 48<sup>th</sup>, and 56<sup>th</sup> need to be studied because it is a real bottleneck. Abbott noted that the Plan includes the 2+1. This Plan does not continue with the theory that we are going to widen in the foreseeable future. We update the long range plan every 5 years. For the length of this Comprehensive Plan, there are no plans to widen these north-south streets. However, the plan does not preclude never widening those streets. Bills wonders if there needs to be a study to determine how backed up that traffic gets. Brienzo offered that the Plan recommends to continue to monitor the corridors of the city in order to maintain an acceptable level of service. A report will issued on an annual basis. That will feed into the Annual Review of the Comprehensive Plan. If a study is determined to be necessary through that process, then we would follow up at that point.

Abbott pointed out that we are trying to get people out on the peripheral routes with the beltways as an alternative means of transportation. Bills thinks the Antelope Valley will funnel more traffic onto 27<sup>th</sup>.

Carlson believes that the issue of north/south, east/west motion in the built environment is addressed all over in this Plan. The study of the north/south part comes through the continual monitoring program. The issue of north/south motion is addressed everywhere in all kinds of ways, i.e. beltways, the land use plan with more commercial and employment centers, etc. As Lincoln grows up we're going to have to change some of our habits. We are going to need to encourage people to get on the freeways. Or maybe more commercial areas are going to be closer to where you live. In 10 years he believes the traffic relief will start to show up because of the land use issue.

Bills does not think most people are on 27<sup>th</sup> to get to Walmart.

Bills inquired about the need for the study on No. 14<sup>th</sup>. Brienzo advised that the issue is that it is a residential sensitive area. Abbott added that there are some environmental and physical problems. The study is needed to attempt to find an alternative.

Newman believes that Congestion Management discussed 30' right-of-way for the 2+center turn lane and she wants to see that in the plan.

Carlson asked about the status of Highway 2 with the South Beltway. Abbott indicated that the goal of the beltway will be to get the commercial through traffic off of existing Hwy 2. It will become an arterial street within the city.

With regard to the East Beltway, Abbott clarified that the Planning Commission, City Council and County Board approved a corridor location for the south and for the east



beltway. The impact statement record decision for the East Beltway is still not completed because of the additional work on historic properties. Once that is completed, we will then be ready to do the functional design and define more specifically the alignment within that 1/4 mile corridor. We have money in the CIP for the engineering and right-of-way acquisition of the east beltway within this timeframe. It is our goal to have the South Beltway open in 2009. Along the East Beltway we will be getting the design in line so that we can tell people where it is going to be and hopefully get some right-of-way acquisition.

Schwinn noted a 2-mile section of East 98<sup>th</sup> Street that is not paved. He inquired whether the city has the right-of-way. Brienzo stated that we do not have the right-of-way. It will have to be purchased. It is not programmed so it is not within the 6-year planning activity. It is in the 20-25 year timeframe. The County Engineer is showing it as potentially paved. The city will assist the County Engineer to get the 120' right-of-way and build it as a rural roadway first and then upgrade to urban. It is currently a gravel road.

Schwinn wondered why an indoor ice arena is listed in the Comprehensive Plan (F137). Morgan believes there is some city involvement. This would be a question that the Parks Departments would need to answer. Schwinn agrees it would be great to have one, but there are a lot of other facilities that would be great to have that should also be mentioned if we are going to mention an indoor ice arena.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m. The public hearing is scheduled to begin on Wednesday, March 13, 2002, at 1:00 p.m.